

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
WESTERN DIVISION

Brenda C. Williams,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	No. 12-2933
)	
Youth Villages, Douglass)	
Walker, Gigi (Gail) Franklin,)	
Rebecca Hancock, and LaTonya)	
Pendleton,)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER

Before the Court are Defendants Youth Villages and LaTonya Pendleton's ("Pendleton") November 12, 2013 Motion to Dismiss Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12 (the "Motion to Dismiss"), Youth Villages and Pendleton's January 3, 2014 Renewed Motion to Dismiss Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12 (the "Renewed Motion"), and the Magistrate Judge's March 5, 2014 Report and Recommendation (the "Report").¹ (Mot. Dismiss, ECF No. 17; Renew. Mot. Dismiss, ECF No. 20; Report, ECF No. 21.) Plaintiff Brenda Williams ("Williams") has not objected to the Magistrate Judge's Report and the time for doing so has passed. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) ("Within fourteen

¹ The Motion and the Renewed Motion were filed by counsel on behalf of all the Defendants in this action. (Memo. Supp. Mot. Dismiss at 1-2, ECF No. 17-1; Memo. Supp. Renew. Mot. Dismiss at 1, ECF No. 20-1.)

days after being served with a copy [of the Magistrate Judge's Report], any party may serve and file written objections to such proposed findings and recommendations as provided by rules of court."). The Magistrate Judge recommends that the Court deny the Motion to Dismiss, grant the Renewed Motion, and dismiss Williams' Complaint in its entirety. For the following reasons, the Court ADOPTS the Report of the Magistrate Judge. Defendants' Motion to Dismiss is DENIED and Defendants' Renewed Motion is GRANTED.

Congress intended 28 U.S.C. § 636 to relieve the burden on the federal judiciary by permitting the assignment of district court duties to magistrate judges. See United States v. Curtis, 237 F.3d 598, 602 (6th Cir. 2001) (citing Gomez v. United States, 490 U.S. 858, 869-70 (1989)); see also Baker v. Peterson, 67 F. App'x 308, 310 (6th Cir. 2003). "A district judge must determine de novo any part of a magistrate judge's disposition that has been properly objected to." Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). "'Only those specific objections to the magistrate's report . . . will be preserved for [] review.'" Carson v. Hudson, 421 F. App'x 560, 563 (6th Cir. 2011) (quoting Souter v. Jones, 395 F.3d 577, 585 (6th Cir. 2005)); see also Smith v. Detroit Fed'n of Teachers, Local 231, 829 F.2d 1370, 1373 (6th Cir. 1987).

After reviewing the evidence, the court is free to accept, reject, or modify the proposed findings or recommendations of the magistrate judge. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). The district court is not required to review—under a de novo or any other standard—those aspects of the report and recommendation to which no objection is made. Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985). The district court should adopt the findings and rulings of the magistrate judge to which no specific objection is filed. Id. at 151.

Williams has not objected to the Magistrate Judge's Report. The deadline for objecting, which was explicitly referenced in the Report, has passed. Because Williams has failed to object, Arn counsels the Court to adopt the Report in its entirety. Id. Adopting the Report is consistent with the policies underlying § 636, specifically judicial economy and protecting against the "functions of the district court [being] effectively duplicated as both the magistrate and the district court perform identical tasks." Howard v. Sec'y of Health & Human Servs., 932 F.2d 505, 509 (6th Cir. 1991).

The Magistrate Judge's Report is ADOPTED. The Motion to Dismiss Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12 is DENIED and the Renewed Motion to Dismiss Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12 is GRANTED. Williams' complaint is DISMISSED.

So ordered this 21st day of March, 2014.

s/ Samuel H. Mays, Jr.
SAMUEL H. MAYS, JR.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE